G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

Police 181-93

File No. 57-99

191 .

(Police)

Serial Nos. 1–3

Later references.

Police 65-1900

18

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1– 3

Major **Part B for** July 1900.

SUBJECT.

Powers of the Inspector General of Police regarding expenditure under 'Secret service and 'good. Service"!

From the Inspector General of Police

No ~~1~~ 2587-127 d 8-1-1900.

Requests that the Comptr may be authorised to admit the expenditure sanctioned by him for 'Secret Service in the French Rocks subdivision.

2 From the Comptr No 645-2/2253 d 19.6.1900

Reports upon the case brought to notice by the Inspector General of Police and suggests that the D.C may be authorised to sanction Rs 50/- under the head 'Secret Service!!

GPB—3,500—21-7-14

To The D. G. & The Comptr
No 653-4 J67. dt 16-7-1900.

Defines the powers of the D. G. P. Rlys. in regard to expenditure under the Heads Secret Service & Rewards for Good Services.

Initialed
BHR

SECTION Police Sub. to Sec 4 (18)

FILE No. 57-99

SERIAL No. 1

(ref order of 11.8.90 (serial no. 8) lays down that -

"With regard to expenditure under the head 'Secret Service' the I. G. of Police as the Controlling authority is empowered to sanction expenditure up to Rs. 100/-"

The I. Gs interpretation of the above is that the limit of Rs. 100/- applies to expenditure in each case and not to total expenditure.

The Comptroller's

attention to that
the wording of the
above order is
ambiguous, and that
the limit of Rs. 1000/-
may be construed for
a single District
or for the whole
Province.

From the Madras
Govt. Proc. (copy rec'd
from the Residency)
it does not appear
that the Govt's powers
& sanctions are
restricted in any
way. A certain sum
is budgetted for
Secret Service money
and all that is
required is that

accounts of the
Expenditure should
be rendered (to Govt.)
half-yearly, thus
order was issued in 1866.

I have referred to
a compilation of the
Madras Police orders
corrected up to Sept-
1899 and cannot
find any limit
placed on the D.S.'s
powers of sanction.

Our Budget
allotment under
the head is Rs. 300/-
for each District &
Rs. 150/- for the French
Rocks. Sub Div- The
expenditure in the
latter upto 17th Nov-
1899 amounted
to Rs. 104-12-4

and the Comptroller
objects to pass the small
sum in excess of Rs. 100/-
unless the G. of I obtains
S. sanction for this
Excess. 11/7/00

Proceedings
Please draft as follow

The order of 31st August 1899,
differentiates between rewards
for "decent Service" and
rewards for "good service"
It was naturally the intention
of Govt that the Head
of the Police Dept should
have a freer hand in
regard of the former
than in that of the latter.
The Govt was accordingly
empowered to sanction
expenditure upto Rs 100
under "decent service"
while he was called to
exhaust Govt for
official sanction every
recommendation for
the grant of reward
for "good service" irres-
pective of the ~~sum~~ sum
amount involved -
He felt the inconvenience
of this order as regards

Please give me
a draft
Yours G
13-7-00

rewards for "good service"
and accordingly made
a representation to Govt
who in ~~this~~ Pro: No 15858 - 8: 6

Dy 19: March 1894 — 9 Fr. 371-92

" authorized him to pay without
the necessity of each description pe-
-wards ~~for~~ to the extent of
Rs 50 in each case within
the limit of the Budget
grant — Previously to that order
~~the Collector~~
he had in the one case only
power to grant
a reward up to Rs 100
while in the other he had
none at all - The latter
disability was removed
and power given to him
to the extent of Rs 50.
The order of 11: August 90
does not use the words
" in each case" as the
order of 19: March 94
does. But it was
certainly not intended
that the 2nd should
not have larger
powers, much less
that he should have
smaller powers, in
the matter of rewards
for "decent service"
than in that of rewards

"for good service"
with the opinion of
Govt. agree that the
Dy C that he is entitled
to sanction rewards
in each case under
the former head. & the
amount of Rs 100. subject of course to
that all that must be
observed within (that
the total Budget allotment - is
should not be exceeded
by the sanction - of Govt - 20
remove all doubt-
and ambiguity, on the point, they now Mean
lay down that the Dy C
powers are limited to
Rs 100 in each case
of reward for "meri-
torious" and to Rs 50
in each case of reward
for "good service"

(1)

F. 694

7

OFFICE OF THE
6360
9-1-09
189
DIWAN OF MYSORE

SECTION Police

FILE No. 57-99 Fo

SERIAL No. 1

The Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Depts.

(106/a)

Dated

Despatched 8th January/1900

Received

General No. 2587
No. 127

Enclosure No. 1

stating that the Comptroller, for the first time, raised objection with regard to the amount of money which is Rs 104-12-4, sanctioned by the Inspector General for the French Rocks, & requesting that the comptroller may be authorised to admit the expenditure sanctioned by the Inspector General.

Jud

9-1-1900

Refer put up
DB
10/1/1900

Submitted
Yes
17/1

OFFICE OF THE

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

No. 2587/127 Dated 8.E.9 January

Enc. 1

FROM

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

SIR,

With reference to the Comptroller's Audit objection slip No. 87 dated 17th November 1899, herewith forwarded in original I have the honor to state that the Budget allotment under the head "Secret Service" is Rs 300/- for each District and Rs 150/- for the French Rocks Sub Division. The Comptroller in the objection slip pointed out that the amount expended under the head 'Secret Service' in the French Rocks Sub-Division upto 17th November 1899 exceeded Rs 100/- and that sanction of Government should be obtained for Rs 4-12-- drawn in excess of Rs 100/-.

2 In reply the Comptroller was informed that the expenditure referred to was not in excess of the allotment and that the sanction of Government was not therefore necessary.

The

The Comptroller returned the objection Slip stating that though the expenditure was written the "Budget Grant", the Inspector General is empowered to sanction expenditure only up to Rs 100/- per — Government Proceedings No. $\frac{5039-48}{Cir.\ 105}$ dated 11th August 1890.

3 I beg to state that this is the first instance in which the Comptroller raised objection and that sums of over Rs 100/- month for separate items were being passed hitherto without question. The amount charged in the detailed Contingent bill of the Telicherry Rocks Sub-Division for the month of July 99 is Rs 45/- and that for the month of August 1899 is Rs 59-12-0. It will therefore be seen that Rs 104-12-0 was not expended as one item and that the Comptroller is not justified in his interpretation applying the limit of Rs 100/- to total expenditure instead of expenditure in each case.

4 Under these circumstances, I request that you will be so good as to authorize the Comptroller to admit the expenditure sanctioned by me,

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

V. V. Krishna Menon

Inspector General of Police

VV

MYSORE Police

No. 57-99 189 22/6/99

From No. 2

THE COMPTROLLER,

MYSORE GOVT.

106

To

THE SECY. TO GOVT. OF MYSORE,

Dept.

Dated 6 June 99

Despatched

Received

No. 6452

No. 2253

SUBJECT MATTER.

In reply to his No. 8950 dated 31st May last — 812

Suggesting that the Inspector General may be authorised to sanction Rs. 50/- in each case with the premium as in the case of Rewards and good conduct

Refer put up & subs: for o. May this await the receipt of the Records the Inspector Gen: applied for through the Commr. 14. 9/6/99

27/6/00

Treasury DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE OF THE

COMPTROLLER, GOVT. OF MYSOI

BANGALORE, 14th June 1897

om

E. R. SUBRAYER, Esq.,

COMPTROLLER, GOVT. OF MYSORE.

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,

General and Revenue DEPT.

In reply to your No. 8950. J.812 dated 1st February
ast, I have the honour to state that in para 2 of Government
roceedings No. 5039-48 Cir.105 dated 11th August 1890 the Inspector
eneral of Police as the Controlling authority was empower-
to sanction expenditure up to Rs. 100-0-0 under the head
Secret Service" and forexpenditure exceeding that amount
nd for all sums intended to be granted as Rewards for good
ervices the Special sanction of Government should be obtained
ut in a subsequent Proceedings No. 15858-82 dated 6/1892 the powers of the
nspector General in the latter case was limitted to Rs.50/
in each instance and no relaxation was made in the expenditur
nder "Secret Service" which caused this Office to surmise
hat the ruling on this point was final and accordingly
cted upon.

The wording of the order appears ambiguous the
imit of Rs. 100/- is to be construed for a single District
r for the whole Province. Further the Expenditure under
his head is of a fluctuating nature I would therefore

suggest that the Inspector General may be authorised to sanction Rs. 50-0-0 in each case — within the Budget provision as in the case of Rewards and Good Service. The Surgeon General's letter No. $\frac{2587}{127}$ dated 8th January is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servant.

H Eagles

For Comptroller.

SECTION Home Police

FILE No. 57-99

SERIAL No. 3

13

109

Read:-

1). Letter No.2587/127 dated the 8th Jany'00 from the Inspr Genl of police in Mysore, requesting that the Comptroller may be authorised to admit the expenditure of Rs.104-12-0 sanctioned by him for "Secret service" in the French Rocks Sub Division.

2). Letter No.6452/2253 dated the 19th June 1900 from the Comptroller to the Govt of Mysore, suggesting that the Inspr Genl of police may be authorised to sanction Rs.50/- in each case within the Budget provision as in the case of rewards for good service.

3). Govt Pro: No. 5039-48/Cir. 105 dated the 11th August 1890, defining the powers of the Inspr Genl of Police in regard to expenditure under the head "Secret Service". and "Good Services".

Order thereon.- No. 653-57 9 16-7-1900

The order of 11th August 1890, differentiates between rewards for "Secret service" and rewards for "good service". It was

naturally the intention of Govt that the Head of the police Dept should have a freer hand in respect of the former than in that of the latter The Inspr Genl was accordingly authorised to sanction expenditure upto Rs.100 under "Secret service" while he was asked to submit to Govt for special sanction every recommendation for the grant of a reward for "good service" irrespective of the amount involved. He felt the inconvenience of this order as regards "rewards for good service" and accordingly made a representation to Govt who in pro.No.15858-8½/J.F.371-92 dated 19th March 1894, authorised him to pay without their previous sanction rewards of this description to the extent of Rs.50 in each case within the limit of the Budget grant. Previously to that order he had in the one case power to grant a reward up to Rs.100 while in the other he had none at all. The latter disability was removed and power was given to him to the extent of Rs.50/-. The order of 11th August 1890 does not use the words "in each case " as the order of 19th March 1894 does. But it was certainly

not intended that the I.Gl. should not have larger powers, much less that he should have smaller powers, in the matter of rewards for "secret service" than in that of rewards for "good service". Govt. agree with the opinic of the I.Gl. that he is entitled to sanction rewards in each case under the former head to the extent of Rs.100/- subject of course to the condition that the total Budget allotment is not ~~to be~~ exceeded without previous sanction. To remove all doubt and ambiguity on the point they are now pleased to lay down that the I.Gl's powers are limited to Rs.100/- in each case of reward for "secret service" and to Rs.50/- in each case of reward for "good service".

13-7

Secretary.

To

The Inspector General of Police in Mysore.

,, Comptroller, Mysore Government.

13/7

READ—

Letter No. 2587—127, dated the 8th January 1900, from the Inspector General of Police in Mysore, requesting that the Comptroller may be authorized to admit the expenditure of Rs. 104-12-0 sanctioned by him for "Secret Service" in the French Rocks sub-division.

2. Letter No. 6452—2253, dated the 19th June 1900, from the Comptroller to the Government of Mysore, reporting upon the case brought to notice by the Inspector General of Police and suggesting that the Inspector General of Police may be authorized to sanction Rs. 50 under the head "Secret Service" in each case within the budget provision as in the case of "Rewards for good service."

3. Government Proceedings No. 5039-48—Cir. 105, dated the 11th August 1890, defining the powers of the Inspector General of Police in regard to expenditure under the head "Secred Service" and "Good Services."

No. 653-54—J. 67, DATED BANGALORE, 16TH JULY 1900.

ORDER THEREON—The Order of 11th August 1890 differentiates between rewards for "Secret Service" and rewards for "Good Service." It was naturally the intention of Government that the Head of the Police Department should have freer hand in respect of the former than in that of the latter. The Inspector General was accordingly authorized to sanction expenditure *up to Rs. 100* under "Secret Service" while he was asked to submit to Government for special sanction *every* recommendation for the grant of a reward for good service irrespective of the amount involved. He felt the inconvenience of this Order as regards rewards for "Good Service" and accordingly made a representation to Government, who in Proceedings No. 15858-84—J. F. 371-92, dated 19th March 1894 authorized him to pay, without their previous sanction, rewards of this description to the extent of Rs. 50 *in each case* within the limit of the budget grant. Previously to that Order, he had in the one case power to grant a reward up to Rs. 100 while in the other he had none at all. The latter disability was removed and power was given to him to the extent of Rs. 50. The Order of 11th August 1890 does not use the words "in each case" as the Order of 19th March 1894 does. But it was certainly not intended that the Inspector General should not have larger powers much less that he should have smaller powers in the matter of rewards for "Secret Service" than in that of rewards for "Good Service." Government agree with the opinion of the Inspector General that he is entitled to sanction rewards in each case under the former head to the extent of Rs. 100 subject of course to the condition that the total budget allotment is not exceeded without previous sanction. To remove all doubt and ambiguity on the point, they are now pleased to lay down that the Inspector General's powers are limited to Rs. 100 in each case of reward for "Secret Service" and to Rs. 50 in each case of reward for "Good Service."

C. SREENIVASIENGAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Inspector General of Police in Mysore.
The Comptroller to the Government of Mysore.

Exd.—H.A.R.

1900-1901

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

JUDICIAL

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 16th July 1900

No. 653.
J. (

Defining the powers of the Insp
General of Police in regard to expend
under the heads "Secret Service"
"Rewards for Good Service."